

Defendant, who lives in Dearborn Heights, MI is alleged to have “met” on the internet another man (DOE-2) and discussed child pornography. DOE-2 lives in Sterling Heights, MI. Defendant and Doe-2, in June 2009, agreed that Defendant would travel to the Sterling Heights home of DOE-2 for the purpose of both men together sexually assaulting the young daughter (7 or 8 years old) of DOE-2 and photographing the sexual assaults by each man for their respective child pornography collections.

On the appointed day in June 2009 Defendant traveled to the home where the DOE-2 and his young daughter reside. Both Defendant and DOE-2 photographed one another sexually assaulting the child. DOE-2 sedated his daughter during the sexual assault, and then photographed Defendant digitally penetrating the child’s vagina, performing oral sex on the child, and ejaculating on her. Defendant, then in turn, photographed DOE-2 while DOE-2 sexually assaulted his own daughter. Allegedly after the sexual assaults DOE-2 downloaded the images of the child to his computer after which Defendant then hooked his laptop to DOE-2’s computer and transferred the images from DOE-2’s computer to Defendant’s laptop.

Following the June 2009 sexual assault Defendant frequently emailed DOE-2 and discussed traveling again to DOE-2’s residence to again sexually assault the child and photograph the assaults and exchange pornographic pictures with DOE-2.

Defendant subsequently visited DOE-2 at his home on several occasions, each time bringing his laptop computer in order to download child pornography to DOE-2’s computer from Defendant’s laptop and external hard drive. While at DOE-2’s home, Defendant admitted to DOE-2 that he uses peer-to-peer software to download child pornography from the internet and that he has been sexually attracted to girls between the ages of two and twelve years of age for some time.

Evidence recovered from the home of DOE-2 were computers, computer related media, camera, and an external hard drive found hidden in the ceiling of the basement. Photos identifying two different adult males performing sexual acts on the child victim during the same time period were retrieved.

DOE-2 has positively identified Defendant and himself in photos and positively confirmed that the photos were taken during the sexual assault of his young daughter in June 2009 by himself and Defendant.

In June 2010 Defendant suggested to DOE-2 that he return to the home of DOE-2 where they would again engage in further sexual assaults of the child which would again be photographed as before. The time suggested for this proposed encounter was July 15, 2010. That meeting never occurred. Defendant has admitted that he is the man in the photographs sexually assaulting DOE-2’s sedated child in June 2009.

The crime alleged is a crime of violence against a child who was sedated and completely vulnerable. The crime is an alleged sexual assault. The defendant admits to being the person

depicted in the photograph sexually penetrating the sedated child, performing oral sex on the sedated child, and ejaculating over her sedated body.

Although Defendant has substantial ties to the community, is married, and has been employed at General Motors for 30 years, he has managed to evade the scrutiny of his wife, family, friends, co-workers, and fellow church goers (his wife testified that he attends church every Sunday, even while on vacation) while engaging in perverse violent sexual acts with a 7 or 8 year old child. The wife consequently would not be an appropriate 3rd party custodian, as suggested by defendant's counsel, as she admits to being blind-sided by her husband's behaviors and activities while living under the same roof with him. Furthermore, there are as many as 12 nieces and nephews who visit the home, and the wife works full time, and would be in no position to supervise her husband's activities should she be granted third party custody and he be given a bond.

Defendant is not a candidate for bond. By his own admission he is a child predator, and having committed one known heinous act with a child in 2009, as recently as three weeks ago tried to arrange another violent sexual encounter the same child. The evidence against him is strong, and the nature of the alleged offense is serious and smacks of depravity. He is a danger to the community and to the most vulnerable members of our society, small children. Furthermore he is a risk of flight inasmuch as he faces a possibility of life in prison, notwithstanding the fact that this is his first contact with the law. He has the incentive to flee under these circumstances. There is no condition or combination of conditions of bond that would assure either the safety of the community or Defendant's appearance in court. Detention is Ordered.